



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 November 2025

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z1775/D/25/3372462

61 Kimbolton Road, Portsmouth PO3 6BZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr David Castellano against the decision of Portsmouth City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00565/HOU.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion including hip to gable and flat roof dormer to front elevation. New window to flank elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issue

2. The Council's reason for refusal is specific to the effect of the front dormer on the roofscape of the host property and roofscape character along Kimbolton Road. Although not formally confirmed, it has further advised, that providing the external materials were of similar appearance to those used in the construction of the exterior of the existing dwelling house, the hip to gable roof extension and rear dormer would be permitted development. From my site visit and all the information before me I have no reason to take a different view. Accordingly, the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed front dormer on the character and appearance of the host property and on the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached property on the east side of Kimbolton Road. There are both semi-detached and terraced properties, with a small number of different designs, within a predominantly residential area.
4. The proposal is a hip to gable roof extension with front and rear dormer.
5. There are a very small number of examples of front dormers within the road within the vicinity of the appeal property, and on the opposite side of the road. However, and notwithstanding these few examples of front roof dormers, overall, the front roofscapes are generally unaltered and roof planes have not been interrupted and provide a consistent and cohesive pattern along the street.
6. I consider that the introduction of a front dormer, particularly of the size and scale and materials as proposed would introduce a discordant element both in relation to the host property as well as the wider street scene. It would introduce a bulky element at roof level that would result in a top-heavy appearance to the property and therefore detract from the character and appearance of the existing property. It

would also interrupt the generally consistent line of original roof forms and would appear visually incongruous in the wider street scene.

7. I disagree with the Appellant's contention that there have been multiple cases whereby front roof dormers have been permitted in the immediate vicinity. Nonetheless, I have taken into account the small number of existing roof dormers that have been permitted and built out along this part of Kimbolton Road. Two of these were permitted over twenty-five years ago, and therefore before the current national planning and local development plan were in force. Two are more recent, albeit I am advised and as seen at my site visit, that the permission granted at No 71 in 2021, has not been built out and, in the Council's view, the permission has now lapsed. Whilst I acknowledge that the Council has granted permission for two front dormers within the vicinity in recent years, this proposal comes before me for determination, and I have assessed it on its planning merits as I am required to do. The existence of this small number of other examples does not persuade me that more should be allowed, given the harm I have concluded both to the existing property and to the street scene.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal, and in particular the proposed front dormer would harm the character and appearance of the existing property and the street scene. This would conflict with Policy PCS23 of the Portsmouth Local Plan 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework, and in particular Section 12, both of which amongst other matters seek a high quality of design which respects the local context.
9. Both the Appellant and the Council has referred to the Pre-Submission Portsmouth Local Plan 2020 – 2040 and Policy PLP1 which seeks a high quality of design which respects the local context. It was not referenced in the refusal notice and I have no information regarding the current status of the draft plan, but it confirms the Council's continued emphasis in accordance with its existing development plan and the national objectives on securing high quality design which respects the local character.
10. The Appellant has advised that he would accept a condition relating to the proposed materials for the roof extensions and alterations, but this on its own would not overcome the harm I have concluded from the introduction of a front dormer.
11. I have taken into account that the proposals would result in additional living accommodation for the Appellant but the harm I have concluded would remain after those personal reasons had ceased to be material.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR